



CONVERSATION RECORD

8/23/2017

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU

Scott P. Murray, et al.

DATE OF CONTACT

08/15/2017

TYPE OF CONVERSATION

E-MAIL

TELEPHONE

INCOMING

OUTGOING

E-MAIL ADDRESS

Scott.Murray@ge.com

TELEPHONE NUMBER

(910) 819-5950

ORGANIZATION

Global Nuclear Fuel - Americas (GNF-A)

DOCKET NUMBER(S)

07109294

LICENSE NUMBER(S)

NA

CONTROL NUMBER(S)

NA

SUBJECT

8/15/2017, 3:00 PM CONFERENCE CALL TO DISCUSS CHANGES TO THE MODEL NO. NPC SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT AND POSSIBLE INITIAL QUESTIONS ON THE APPLICATION (CAC NO. L25228)

SUMMARY

Attendees:

NRC

Norma Garcia Santos

William (Chris) Allen

Zhian Li

Christina Leggett

GNF-A

Scott P. Murray

Lon E. Paulson

Continue on Page 2

ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY)

See Summary.

Continue on Page 3

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION

Norma Garcia Santos, Zhian Li, Christina Leggett, Scott P. Murray, and Lon E. Paulson

SIGNATURE

CONVERSATION RECORD (continued)

SUMMARY: (Continued from page 1)

On August 15, 2017, NRC and GNF-A (the applicant) participated in a phone call. The applicant requested the phone call to discuss changes to the application (safety analysis report) related to the ongoing licensing action request for the Model No. NPC. Nevertheless, some of the questions from the applicant were focused on the estimated number of hours for the review included on the acceptance letter and the licensing process, including how to determine staff availability for a review. The following items summarize the discussion during the August 15 telephone call.

In terms of the schedule, the applicant noted that it was expecting to have received requests for additional information soon since the application was submitted on June 19, 2017, which is about 60 days after the date of the submittal. The staff responded that the staff considers factors such as the need and priority of the request as well as the staff's availability when developing the schedule. The applicant also asked how the staff determines its availability. The staff indicated the following:

1. Based on a prior discussion with GNF-A\GE Hitachi, the application of the RAJ-II letter authorization was a higher priority than the NPC application.
2. The criticality safety reviewer for this case currently has 16 cases and there are periods in which he would not be in the office during the review of this case (staff needs to be available to review the application).
3. There will be a materials reviewer and a containment reviewer added to the review team to ensure that the staff perform a complete review of the proposed change to the NPC application.
4. The cover letter and the road map should clearly describe the licensing action request when adding contents to the package by clearly mentioning the proposed contents to be added to the package.

For example, the staff noted during the detailed review that the applicant proposed UF4 as authorized content, but it was not explicitly mentioned in the cover letter or the road map of the application. The applicant pointed out that it did not understand the concern since UF4 is a pretty stable powder, and that it was not UF6. The staff indicated that it will be adding two reviewers to the team to ensure a complete review of the application.

In terms of the estimated number of review hours in the acceptance letter, the applicant indicated that it found the estimate of the review hours high. The applicant estimated that it would require 50 hours for this review instead of 350 hours, since it should be a straightforward review and the GNF3 review of the RAJ-II (considered a more complex request) took 150 hours of review. The staff pointed out that a 50 hours estimate was low considering the time spent on the review, preparation of correspondence, development of the safety evaluation reports, and other aspects related to the licensing process. The staff also indicated that the hours of review may be more or fewer than the ones estimated.

At the end of the meeting, the applicant asked if the staff had questions about the application. The criticality reviewer indicated that he is still reviewing the application and recently came back from travel. Another staff is shadowing him but she is not charging time to this review. The staff noted that there may be questions related to demonstrating the case of maximum reactivity in the package. The applicant asked the staff to contact them with any questions come up during the review. The staff indicated that communication should be coordinated through Chris Allen, who will be taking over as the project manager for this case.